

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

I was recently in Canada during their national election and was able to witness firsthand the media coverage provided by CBC. In the final days leading up to the election CBC provided phenomenal coverage balanced and fair for all of the candidates. This election (like our own) had much negative advertising but CBC rose above the partisan rhetoric and provided a public service like none that has been present in American Politics ever. I do not want to silence critics of either candidate rather I will defend to the death their right to say what they want but we must hold our broadcasters accountable to provide access for all points of view and we must also charge these broadcasters air wave usage fees that will fund alternative broadcasting in the public interest. Thankyou.

Sincerely,
Bret Hooper